

**REMARKS****Interview held November 22, 2010**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for her kindness and assistance during a brief Interview, which was held on 22 November, 2010 between the Examiner and Applicant's representatives, Michael A. Glenn. During the Interview, Applicant pointed out that the Komatsu reference relied upon by the Examiner in connection with a rejection under 35 USC § 103, having a priority date of March 16, 2001, did not qualify as prior art in view of Applicant's filing date of February 4, 2000 and Applicant's priority date of October 15, 2009. If Applicant's understanding is incorrect, Applicant asks that the Examiner understand that there is no intent on Applicant's part to misrepresent the substance of the Interview and that Applicant has only endeavored in good faith to provide an accurate and faithful recitation of facts concerning the Interview as Applicant understands them.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103**

Claims 1 – 3, 15, 17 – 21, 55 – 75, and 78 – 86 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over US patent number 5,892,900 (Ginter) and further in view of US patent publication number 2002/0143807 (Komatsu).

The Komatsu reference relied upon by the Examiner in connection with the rejection under 35 USC § 103, having a priority date of March 16, 2001, does not qualify as prior art in view of Applicant's filing date of February 4, 2000 and Applicant's priority date of October 15, 2009. Accordingly, there exists no basis for further refusal of this application.

Applicant also notes that Ginter is irrelevant to the claimed invention as lacking "a security server to prevent the user from performing a standard operation..." Further, Applicant notes that Ginter is concerned with software publishing (140/25-38) and not

specifically document delivery where "a security server [is used] to prevent the user from performing a standard operation on said version, said standard operation consisting of any of copying, printing, or saving." The skilled person would not consider a software publishing application when seeking to deliver at least two versions of a document, where one version is inhibited by a security server (which is not taught) from performing a standard operation. Accordingly, even if another reference could be found and cited by the Examiner to replace Komatsu, the rejection would still be defective for failing to make a *prima facie* showing of obviousness.

The application has now been through several rounds of prosecution and has been the subject of several searches by the Examiner. This submission is Applicant's second submission without claim amendment, which means that the Examiner will now have considered these exact claims three times once she has reviewed this submission. Applicant is of the opinion that the Examiner has, commendably, conducted a thorough and exhaustive examination of this application. As such, the next appropriate step would be to allow the application to pass to issuance as U.S. Letters Patent.

Should The Examiner deem it helpful, she is encouraged to contact Applicant's attorney, Michael A. Glenn, at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael A. Glenn  
Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862